DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 175 798 SP 012 338

AUTHOR Dullea, Barbara A.
TITLE Curriculum Centers in Institutions of Higher Education in New York State and in Selected Midwestern Institutions.
NOTE 40;

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Curriculum Development; *Curriculum Planning; Higher Education; *Information Centers; Library Collections; *Resource Materials; *Special Libraries; Teacher Centers; Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

The formation, administration, and use of curriculum centers in universities was studied for the purpose of clarifying their objectives and making recommendations for their improvement. These centers contain a specialized collection of materials and equipment designed to aid curriculum development and to provide students who are preparing for a career in teaching with the various materials needed for planning and improving curriculum. The results of a survey conducted in such centers are presented, listing the services and resources available in each. The questionnaire used in the survey is appended. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED175798

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Barbara A. Dullea

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CURRICULUM CENTERS IN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION IN NEW YORK STATE AND IN SELECTED MID-WESTERN INSTITUTIONS

Barbara A. Dullea
Associate Librarian
State University of New York at Buffalo
1978

SP012338

INTRODUCTION

To support programs in teacher education and especially to support curriculum development programs for elementary and secondary schools, curriculum laboratories or centers such as the Center for Curriculum Development at SUNYAB have developed during the past twenty or thirty years. In-service training programs, a growing concept, as well as pre-service training programs have greatly influenced the evolution of such centers.

In addition to the materials collected at SUNYAB by FES (Faculty of Educational Studies) at the Center for Curriculum Planning, some additional material is selectively collected at Lockwood Memorial Library. However, both collections and even the combined collections are inadequate in size, quality and accessibility to support the strong programs in teacher education on this campus. This study was undertaken so that recommendations might be made to FES and to the University Libraries to improve the situation.

The curriculum or instructional center is a specialized collection of materials and equipment, designed to aid curriculum development and provide the student who is preparing for a career in teaching with the various materials needed for planning and preparing for instruction and in recent years has been also seen as a resource center for teachers in the field. Any college or university offering extensive programs in teacher education needs such a well organized collection to support the instructional programs offered in teacher education. The types of materials collected in curriculum centers are not the usual monographic and serial publications found in university libraries, although sometimes they are incorporated in the collections of education branch libraries. Curriculum guides published by individual school systems in specific content areas, state syllabi, elementary and secondary textbooks, educational games, standardized educational tests, pamphlets, children's literature, films, filmstrips, slide-tapes, and graphic arts materials all should be available to make the center a workshop for the future and present teacher. Depending on the resources available, the extent of the collection and the types of materials collected should be as varied and as innovative as the latest developments in curriculum planning taking place throughout the United States. While usually such centers support curriculum research and development in elementary and secondary schools there is no reason why they are so limited. If similar materials, outside the usual collection policy of university libraries are needed for curriculum planning in higher education, they, too could be made available in a curriculum center.

No national standards have been developed by any agency for the acquisition and organization of curriculum materials in institutions of higher education educating teachers. Such standards most probably would be developed by either the National Education Association or the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development or the Association of College and Research Libraries.

Since many curriculum centers, instructional materials centers and teacher centers located at universities and colleges are administered by the institutions's library, it is possible that ACRL will take a step in the direction of developing standards. In fact in February 1976 it was noted by the Chairman of the Education and Behavioral Sciences Section of the Association of College and Research Libraries that "curriculum materials... is one of the most difficult, yet least studied in all of academic librarianship."[1]

HISTORY OF CURRICULUM PLANNING

The importance of curriculum centers which provide extensive innovative materials at institutions educating teachers can hardly be emphasized strongly enough if the history of curriculum planning in the United States is understood and if the basis for educational reform is clear. Current controversy over teaching practices throughout the nation and especially over the tested results of that teaching make it imperative that more research be initiated in the field of curriculum planning. The practitioners, i.e. the teachers, have always, because of the structure of our educational system,been involved in any changes in this area,so must be involved in the planning.

It is interesting to note that the Constitution of the United States does not mention education but under the principles of the Tenth Amendment[2] broadly left the responsibility of the education of children to the people through their individual state governments. At first local communities held complete control over public education but soon all state governments included in their constitutions the ultimate power over education. Although the parent has the fundamental right to control the education of his children, this right must be compatable with the communal right or the laws of the state. Local school boards broadly administer the educational structure in their communities but usually the state through state boards of education exercises general control and supervises the individual communities.

Although the main principle that the state must provide free, nonsectarian elementary and secondary education, is held nationwide, what actually should be taught is left up to the individual states. It is only since the early part of the nineteenth century that the states have supported public education to any extent and at that time the curriculum was quite basic. In fact as late as 1920 a study conducted by the Commission on Length of Elementary Education showed that the elementary school mainly taught the basics of reading, writing and mathematics but was beginning to be influenced by scientific inquiry. It took the violent changes of

1 Wayne Gossage. "Letter to ACRL/EBSS Members." College and Research Library News, 37 (February 1976), 31-32.

2 "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, or to the people." United States Code, 1977 edition (Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1977) 1, p. 33.

the twentieth century to radically change school curricula and to foster great interest in educational research and especially research in curriculum development. G. Robert Koopman maintains that the results of developments in experimental psychology and educational philosophy "was the widespread modernization of curriculums that began about 1920 and led to the development of a rational, educational planning process which has come to be called curriculum development."[1] Koopman further maintains that although it is obvious that some form of curriculum development has been taking place throughout educational history it might be more precise to state that "deliberate and systematic 'curriculum development' as a well-defined and technical process appeared about a decade later."[2]

TEACHER EDUCATION

Changing ideas on teacher education and curriculum development are closely related. Arguments still abound concerning the need for professional teacher education. Some still feel that a strong foundation in one or more disciplines is adequate for the education of teachers. Others strongly support a specialized curriculum for educators. At any rate the education of teachers has been a major concern of leaders in our country for some time. Before the Civil War a few private academies offered teacher training programs and after the Civil War normal schools specifically dedicated to teacher training opened across the nation. The first normal schools required only an elementary education as a prerequisite for admission. At first many of the normal schools were simply a one year extension of high school but later became two, three and four year schools and eventually became state teachers colleges. Later they evolved into state colleges which offered a broader program not restricted to teacher education. The early normal schools prepared teachers for the elementary grades and high school teachers were trained in subject areas in private universities and colleges, little emphasis being put on methods of teaching. Later when normal schools became state colleges, programs for secondary teaching were added. In the early normal schools the young teachers were to be firmly grounded in the basic subjects taught at that time in the elementary grades but as the normal school evolved into a four year state college the course offerings were much broader and the curriculum came to embrace those subjects found in private liberal arts colleges. At the same time, as pointed out previously, the radical changes in life in the 20th century made educators come to believe that equally radical changes must be made in the public school curriculum so that students could cope with the constantly changing problems of this century.

1 G. Robert Koopman, Curriculum Development (New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, Inc., 1966) p. 2.

2 Ibid p. 2.

TEACHERS AND CURRICULUM PLANNING

Although most states set the broad outline for subject matter to be covered in their public schools, the specific curriculum was left to the individual school's systems and in most cases, ultimately to the teachers. It was felt by many that each teacher should be involved in curriculum development. Probably his first introduction to it was in methods courses in various subject area fields and then in the preservice training known as the laboratory experience or student teaching. Although the states leave the burden of educational policy to individual school districts, many do prescribe the courses of study which must be taught at various levels, so curriculum development at this level is a state problem; but the development of the material used within the prescribed course of study or syllabus is local and should involve the teacher. Although in the past textbooks often limited the material taught, today the teacher is expected to construct much of his teaching materials himself and use various source materials. In-service training has become a requirement in most school systems and workshops and seminars are often used to stimulate new thinking about curriculum content.

To assist the teachers in curriculum revision and planning, curriculum laboratories or centers developed at most teacher education institutions, in some school district administrative offices, at some state education departments and within some public schools. Sometimes they operate as separate centers and sometimes as a part of the school or college library. Most centers initially collected elementary and secondary textbooks, curriculum guides and outlines, syllabi, graphic material, and children's literature, i.e. print material not usually collected in a college or university library, but necessary to the education of teachers. Influenced by the technology of the twentieth century, audio-visual materials were acquired by many curriculum centers together with the necessary A-V equipment. Some institutions set up separate AV centers but many curriculum centers invested in their own equipment. At about this time the name "instructional materials center" became popular and often was used synonomously for curriculum center, meaning a curriculum center expanded to include the media. Actually a great variety of centers will be found throughout the country--all working with curriculum planning.

TEACHER CENTERS

An idea that has surfaced relatively recently is that of the teacher center. Teacher centers appear at institutions of higher education and in elementary and secondary schools much as curriculum centers still do, and in at least one case in Chicago, a teacher center was independently set up outside of these institutions because of the interest of a small group of teachers who felt strongly that such a center was needed. Teacher centers seem to differ in two ways. While the earlier curriculum centers usually were influenced by the physical layout of traditional

library arrangements, teacher centers often have more of an atmosphere of a production center where teachers can actually construct instructional materials to be used in the classroom, as well as work on formulating their own written curriculum guides and outlines. Some teacher centers differ administratively and this type of center has caught the attention of educators nationwide. At the University of Toledo a consortium approach has been used involving the resources and attention of the College of Education, regional school administrators and community leaders. The hope of the educators at the University who have developed the plan is that the administrative consortium will widen its base and eventually become a state and national network of teacher centers.

SURVEY BY QUESTIONNAIRE

In addition to a review of the available literature on curriculum (instructional, teacher) centers as well as a brief review of the latest developments in curriculum planning and teacher education, twenty-seven institutions were surveyed by mail using a questionnaire (see Appendix A) designed to cover what the actual practice is in the administration, physical setting, stock, classification, shelving, circulation, equipment, selection and acquisition of materials for curriculum centers.

Because of the existing cooperative policies in many areas that link SUNY institutions, all SUNY colleges and university centers that educate teachers were contacted (15). Since the University Libraries at SUNY participate in the FAUL (Five Associated University Libraries) consortium, the three non-SUNY members were also surveyed (Syracuse University, University of Rochester and Cornell). Three institutions in New York City which greatly influence the education of teachers in the state were queried (Teachers College at Columbia University, New York University and the Bank Street College of Education). Because there is a Western New York/Ontario Chapter of ACRL and the University Libraries at SUNYAB have always been interested in developments in academic librarianship in Ontario, the University of Toronto and the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education were also included. After a preliminary literature search, four midwestern universities having strong programs in teacher education were identified: Western Michigan University, University of Wisconsin at Madison, University of Toledo and Wayne State University, and they also were surveyed.

Twenty-six of the twenty-seven institutions queried responded, either with a completed questionnaire or with a letter of explanation. Five of the twenty-six respondents reported that their institutions do not have curriculum centers. Completed questionnaires were returned by twenty-one institutions and these constitute the basis for the following information.

Five centers are presently administered by schools of education, fifteen by the college or university library and one by both the library and the school of education; but when the respondents were asked what the ideal situation would be, six respondents felt that the center could be administered equally well by the library or the school of education, two opted for the school, eight for the library, one for co-administration by both, and two felt that it depended upon the local situation (two did not respond to this question). In other words while 71% of the centers are now under library administration only 38% of the respondents felt that this was necessarily the best administration. 29% felt that the administration of the center would be equally effective under either the library or the school of education. Therefore actually 67% of the respondents were willing to have library administration.

Sixteen of the center directors are librarians with MLS degrees. One director has an MA in education. One has a Ph.D. in educational technology. One center has co-directors, a librarian (MLS) and an educator (MA in educational media). One center did not reply to this question and one does not have a director. When queried as to whether the center in an ideal situation whould be directed by a librarian or instead by some other qualified person, the respondents all indicated their satisfaction with the actual situation. That is, sixteen indicated librarian directors were needed and the three special cases noted above responded with the qualifications of their present directors. However it might be noted that several of the respondents who indicated that a librarian-director was needed added that the librarian should have experience in conjunction with some teaching experience. The great majority of the centers had full time directors (15) while only four directors held part time positions in their centers.

When tabulating the number of full time and part time staff, the two institutions whose collections were part of their education libraries were not included since the collections were maintained by the entire library staff. In the nineteen separate centers, fourteen had full time staff ranging from one to seven people, the average number being three. They worked from 20-40 hours a week with an average of 35.4 hrs. per week, the median number of hours being 35.5. All of the nineteen centers except one had part time employees, but the two who indicated student assistants did not indicate numbers. Of the remaining sixteen the number of part time employees ranged from one to 23 part time employees with an average of 5.4. The median figure was 2.5 part time employees. The two respondents that did not include the number of part time students that worked did, however, include the average number of hours worked by each part time employee. So with a total of 18 responses, the range was one to 36 hours per week averaged by each part time employee. 15.25 was the average number of hours worked and 16 hours the median.

The institutional enrollment ranged from 5,021 to 45,288 students. Only one of the 21 institutions trained paraprofessionals. Although several did not have undergraduate programs in education, the enrollment for those who did ranged from 300 students to 4,000. Graduate enrollment ranged from 102 students to 4,000. (The individual figures are given in Appendix B.)

Nine centers were in a separate room or rooms within the library; one was a separate space or area within the library; three were part of the education section of the library; six had a room or rooms in the department or school of education building; one had rooms in a classroom/office building; and one was integrated into the curriculum collection. However when asked what they felt would be the best physical setting for a curriculum center, thirteen favored a center within the library; four thought it should be near the offices of the education faculty; one would put it in what was called a "comprehensive educational center" and one would take either option (within the library or near the offices of the faculty). Two did not respond.

The approximate size of the seventeen centers answering the question on size ranged from 800 square feet to 61,000 square feet with an average of 9,226 square feet. The median size was 5,000 square feet. However, only two centers reported centers over 10,000 square feet and they were twice that large or larger. Looking at the 15 centers more equal in size, the average size now becomes 4,942 square feet with the median 4,000 square feet. The percentage of space used for reader space ranged from 11% to 83% with an average of 44% and a median figure of 50%. In fact four of the centers devoted 50% of their space to reader space.

Eight centers collected curriculum and instructional material for elementary schools, secondary schools and institutions of higher education. Eleven collected for elementary and secondary schools only and one for elementary schools only. (One did not answer this section.)

Monographic materials were circulated by the majority of the centers although periodicals were only allowed to circulate by less than half of those who collected them. (see Appendix C). The majority of audiovisual materials were also circulated (for individual figures (see Appendix D). Most of the monographic, periodical and audiovisual materials were classified in either the Dewey or Library of Congress systems (see Appendices E and F for variations) and the card catalog was the means of access for all kinds of material in most of the centers, although indexes, lists and kardexes were also used (see Appendices G and H).

Six centers interfiled different forms of materials on the shelves, ten centers arranged them by form, one center noted that within the form materials were arranged by accession number.

One added that their material was arranged by form only in a general sense since they keep all multimedia in the same classification together. One arranged filmstrips by LC but kept games, cassettes, transparencies, kits etc. on the shelves with monographs. (Four did not answer this question.)

Fourteen centers circulate material to faculty (staff), students and teachers in the area, two with some limitations. Five centers circulate material to faculty (staff) and students. Two do not circulate anything except under special conditions.

Four respondents felt that ideally the collection should be a noncirculating collection. Three thought most of the collection should circulate, one noting that part of it should be a reference collection. Thirteen felt that in an ideal situation all materials should circulate.

If materials circulate, eight respondents felt that ideally circulation should be limited to faculty, staff and students but thirteen thought the center should serve the community and would extend borrowing privileges to teachers in the community. Three of these thirteen would put slight restrictions on community use.

AV equipment was available in the majority of the centers; some used library equipment or equipment available elsewhere on campus. The breakdown was as follows:

		no. of centers
a.	available in center	8
b.	available in library	2
c.	available elsewhere on campus	1
d.	combination of above sources	8
e.	no equipment needed	1
f.	no answer	1

When asked about the viewing possibilities the report was:

		no. of centers
a.	separate room in center for AV viewing	1
b.	AV equipment housed with other material in center for viewing purposes	4
c.	viewing available in the library	2
d.	viewing available elsewhere on campus	1
e.	combination of two or more of above viewing possibilities	11
f.	no equipment needed	1
g.	no answer	1

In eight cases (including combination answers) a separate room was reported, and in all except seven, viewing was possible within the center.

The returns to the question on the pieces of media equipment available were so varied that it is difficult to tabulate them. One center did not collect AV material so did not need the equipment. Three centers noted that the equipment was available elsewhere on campus. One center did not reply to this question. None of the centers had all of the equipment listed in the questionnaire nor was any one kind of equipment to be found in all of the centers. Since the range of pieces of equipment owned was so great, it seemed more meaningful to look at the kinds of equipment owned. The sixteen centers reporting owned as few as two kinds of equipment although two institutions owned eighteen of the twenty-one kinds of equipment listed in the questionnaire. The average number of kinds of equipment held was 10.5 but the mean was a lower figure, 7.5.

The following list indicates the type of equipment available in the centers in ranking order.

Type of Equipment	No. of Centers Where Available
Audiotape recorders	13
Filmstrip viewers	13
Record player with junction box	11
Microreader	10
Sound filmstrip projectors	10
2" x 2" slide projector	10
Film projectors	9
Filmstrip or filmstrip-slide projectors	7
Listening station	7
Overhead projectors	7
Projection carts	7
Projection screens	7
Photocopying machine	6
Duplicating machine	5
Portable videotape recorder system	5
Film inspection and repair equipment	4
Microreader printer	4
Opaque projectors	4
Stereoscopic and microscope slide viewers	3
Polarized attachments for slide projectors	2
Microprojectors	1

In five centers the operating budget was part of the budget of the school of education while fifteen centers operated under the library budget and one reported a budget controlled by both the school of education and the library. When asked about an ideal situation the ideal was close to the actual situation.

Thirteen centers approved of having their budget part of the library budget and only three thought it should be part of the budget of the school of education. Two opted for a combination of both and two felt that it depended entirely upon the local situation. The directors of fourteen of the centers administered the budget; in two of these centers he was also the education bibliographer. In one center the director and the education bibliographer administered the budget and in one, the director of the center and the acquisitions department of the library administered the budget together. In two centers the acquisitions department of the library administered the budget together. In two centers the acquisitions department of the library administered the budget; one center's budget was administered by the faculty; and two budgets were administered by the director of the library. The centers evidently felt that the actual situation was close to the ideal. Fifteen reported that they felt that ideally the director of the center should administer the center's budget. Two thought the education bibliographer should. One felt it should be administered by the acquisitions department of the library. One opted for co-administration between the library director and a curriculum librarian and one suggested a combined effort on the part of the director of the center, the faculty and the acquisitions department of the library.

Many of the centers did not answer the question concerning the policy for handling out-dated materials. Several of those that did indicated that a historical collection was maintained for some material while other material was discarded or offered to students. One center offered outdated curriculum guides and resource units to the Center for Research Libraries in Chicago. The centers that answered the question all periodically weeded their collections.

It would have been helpful if each of the centers queried could have been visited, not only to see the actual physical layout of the libraries and curriculum centers, but so that the librarians and directors of the centers could have been interviewed in person. Since, because of limitations in time and funding, this was impossible, the decision was made to concentrate on the four midwestern centers which had well established curriculum collections.

At Wayne State University and at the University of Wisconsin at Madison the curriculum materials were integrated into what were basically the education libraries,although at Madison the facility was called the Instructional Materials Center. Both had good facilities for teachers to use in making their own presentations using audiovisual materials. Instruction in this area was also provided. At all four universities the graphics, used for display purposes and to designate location of materials, played an important part, not only in the general attractiveness of the facilities but in the overall efficiency of their operations.

At the University of Toledo the curriculum materials are housed in the Teacher Center administered by the College of Education. The idea of a teacher center evolved from the realization that teachers needed to be actively involved in curriculum change and that a facility was needed to serve as a workshop, a kind of communications center and a research area where teachers could work out innovative curriculum ideas and keep abreast of new trends in education. The basic philosophy behind it was that while the more traditional curriculum center tended to be a library-like facility designed primarily for the housing of materials which could be circulated to users, the teacher center would not only house instructional material but it would be a place where teachers could work out their ideas, construct instructional materials and advance curricular ideas. The College of Education at the University of Toledo views its center as having five major organizational, but not physical, divisions:

"1. The management center would be responsible for coordinating, supervising, and administering all activities within the teacher center.

2. The consultation center would deal with specific instructional or educational problems requiring expertise not normally available in the schools.

3. The resource center would make available a wide variety of print and non-print instructional resources appropriate for public school use.

4. A production center would serve as a training area for those educators needing to practice and learn instructional production skills, and for production of print and non-print instructional materials by professional staff and inservice educators.

5. A key division of the teacher center would be the learning center. It is here that a broad array of knowledge and skills important to retraining of educators inservice, would be taught."[1]

The facilities of the Educational Resources Center at Western Michigan University was impressive, not only because of the array of materials offered to students of education and to teachers in the area, but because of the spacious and attractive physical setting. The main part of the Center housed traditional educational and curriculum materials and nearby was a well-equipped, well-serviced and efficiently run Learning Laboratory. It contained a variety of audiovisual equipment, a photographic laboratory, graphics production equipment, and some impressive self-instructional programs in graphics and photography.

[1]George E. Dickson, Planning a Prototype Teacher Center for Ohio. Final Report. (ED 086 677) (Washington, D.C.: Educational Resources Information Center) pp. 39-40.

The information gained by investigating the current status of the curriculum centers listed in this report (see Appendix B) combined with an extensive review of the available literature on curriculum/teacher centers will form the basis for suggestions concerning the future of curriculum materials at SUNYAB.

CURRICULUM MATERIALS AT SUNYAB

If a model curriculum/teacher center could be planned for SUNYAB, with no restrictions placed on the plans, a number of problems would be eliminated. However certain unavoidable factors must be taken into consideration. In the first place serious limitations in funding are being felt by both the University Libraries and the Faculty of Educational Studies. Secondly, Lockwood Memorial Library, Amherst Campus, was not designed to house a curriculum/teacher center, but space has been allotted for such a center in 17 Christopher Baldy Hall. Of the materials listed on pages 3 and 4 of the questionnaire sent to the curriculum centers studied in this report (see Appendix A), Lockwood collects only professional journals, some professional textbooks and microfiche (ERIC documents and selected curriculum guides on microfiche). Children's literature was not included in the materials list although most centers included it, and it is collected at Lockwood. A-V equipment housed in Lockwood is limited to microfilm and microfiche readers and printers. The Center for Curriculum Planning collects or plans to collect most of the remaining material and equipment listed in the questionnaire. (see Appendix A, pp. 3,4,6). Plans for the future will have to consider these actualities and either incorporate them or change them in some way.

The majority of the respondents to the questionnaire favored a center located within the library, and it would be advisable to further investigate their preferences if possible. However, no part of Lockwood Library, Amherst Campus, has been designed for workshop-like areas. But the space in the Center for Curriculum Planning in Baldy Hall could be used for this purpose. Since funding is a problem it probably is wise to depend on the library to collect children's literature and professional journals and texts, with all other types of curricular material to be collected by the center in Baldy.

As noted earlier, although eight respondents felt that the Curriculum Center should be administered by the library and only two favored administration by the school of education, six did feel that either the library or the school of education could adequately administer a center. One opted for a combined administration and two felt that it depended on the local situation. In other words, eleven of the nineteen, or 58%, of those who answered the question felt that faculty administration would be acceptable.

At present the Center for Curriculum Planning is administered by the Department of Curriculum Development and Instructional Media within the Faculty of Educational Studies. However, if the center evolves into a teacher center, other administrative approaches might be feasible. Since the Teachers National Field TAsk Force on the Improvement and Reform of American Education (1974) mentions teacher centers in an appendix to its Final Report and Recommendations, consideration should be given to their view that "teacher centers should be autonomous and teacher-controlled - a non-profit corporation is the most promising model... and...should concentrate on the development of improved teaching as distinguished from other aspects of school operation."[1]

Although complete teacher control might not be possible when the center facilities are in a university setting, if a consortium approach to a teacher center is explored at SUNYAB, teachers in the area could be involved in administration. In Ohio the attempt is being made to set up a statewide network of teacher centers involving the Ohio State Education Department, the University of Toledo and local school boards.

In Teaching Centers: Toward the State of the Scene the authors describe three consortia types of organization used in teaching centers in the United States:

> "Free partnership teaching center. This type of center represents the simplest form of those based on the concept of a consortium. Usually, the partnership involves a school system and a university or college. It could, however, involve two school systems, two universities, or even a noneducational agency. The popularity of the partnership suggests that a two-party relationship is easier to initiate and maintain than a consortium involving three or more institutions. The word "free" refers to the fact that the partnership is entered into willingly, rather than being prescribed legislatively or politically.
>
> ...Examples: Syracuse University--West Genesee Teaching Center; Minneapolis Teacher Center.
>
> Free consortium teaching center. Characterized by three or more institutions willingly entering into a teaching center relationship, the organization, commitments, and policy considerations will usually be more complex and formal than in a free partnership. Financial arrangements are also more complex, with external sources of support frequently being the primary catalyst for creating the consortium.
>
> ...Examples: Atlanta Area Teacher Education Service; Houston Teacher Center

[1] Inside-out: The Final Report and Recommendations of the Teachers National Field Task Force on the Improvement and Reform of American Education. (Washington: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare) p.57.

> Legislative/political consortium teaching center. This type of center is characterized by an organization and constituency prescribed either by legislative mandate or by political influence. Often, but not always, the state education agency oversees the process. In a sense, it is a forced consortium. Although participation by eligible institutions tends to be quite varied, it is not unusual for a financial incentive to exist as an enticement. A rather complex communications system is frequently used to assist the administering agency in program development. Although this type of center is frequently organized on the basis of county boundaries, the organization may range from subcounty to a total state model.
>
> ...Examples: Rhode Island Teacher Center; Texas Center for the Improvement of Educational Systems."[1]

When a decision has been made concerning the administrational structure of the center, that administration, whether it be one person or unit or a consortium of several, must decide whether the center is to be a library-like depository for materials (with study areas) or more of a workshop-laboratory arrangement. Careful plans should be drawn so that interior space is utilized efficiently. It also is wise to remember that concern for colorful graphics always adds to the attractiveness of the interior design. At this point the director of the center will certainly become actively involved in all plans for the center. Whether the administrative board consists of the Department of Curriculum Development and Instructional Media alone or is a consortium consisting of the Department, a local board of education, and the N.Y. State Department of Education or some similar cooperative group, that administrative board should appoint a full-time director who will implement policy set by the board and direct the day to day operation of the center. Ninety per cent of those queried on the survey felt that the director of such a center should be a librarian. The assumption is, of course, that much of the work entailed required a knowledge of the acquisition, classification, storage and dissemination of information -- library/information-science skills. Educational requirements for this position might include graduate work in both education and library science. New York State now certifies librarians/teachers, so candidates with this background might be sought. Additional part-time staff will be needed, particularly if the center is open at night and on weekends.

The expense of staff salaries, equipment and materials might argue for a consortium approach. It certainly would be advisable to at least investigate the possibilities of local and state support. Such an investigation was beyond the parameters set for this study but could be an outgrowth of it.

[1]Allan A. Schneider and Sam J. Yarger. Teaching Centers: Toward the State of the Scene (ED098143) (Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, 1974) pp. 29-30.

A detailed list of materials, print and non-print, would also need to be compiled. After an inventory is taken of the present stock, decisions will have to be made concerning the types of material and equipment needed for the future. The results of the survey conducted for this study indicate that classification, shelving, and circulation procedures vary greatly. It would be advisable to consider the future probability of computerized records in the University Libraries and to plan as many compatable records for the Curriculum Center as possible. This may be possible only for selected types of materials.

This investigation was intended to focus on curriculum centers, their formation, administration and use. As work progressed it became obvious that the teacher centers springing up throughout the country need to be studied, keeping in mind the idea that the Center for Curriculum Development at SUNYAB might evolve into some type of teacher center. This, however, would involve a separate investigation.

Because of time limitations, the recommendations for the Center for Curriculum Planring are also limited. However, drawing from the information on the actual practices in use by the centers surveyed, it is hoped that the administrator of the Center at SUNYAB will have a basis for future decisions concerning the acquisition, classification and circulation of the materials collected and that some thought will be given to the idea of a teacher-center of the consortium type.

Bibliography

Barzun, Jacques and Guff, Henry F. The Modern Reseacher. New York: Harcourt, 1957.

Beauchamp, George. Comparative Analysis of Curriculum Systems. Wilnett, Ill.: Kagg Press, 1972.

Bomar, Cora Paul. Guide to the Development of Educational Media Selection Centers. Chicago: American Library Association, 1973.

Carlson, L.B. and Pollant, W.R. "Serving Teachers in Rural Areas Through a University Associated SEIMC." Exceptional Child 39 (Spring 1972) 58.

Case Studies in Curriculum Change: Great Britain and the United States edited by William A. Reid and Decker R. Walker. London; Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1975.

Church, John Gideon. Administration of Instructional Organizations; Analysis and Evaluative Criteria for Materials Centers. Belmont, California: Fearon Publishers, 1970.

Cubberley Conference, Stanford University, 1969. Confronting Curriculum Reform. edited by Elliot W. Eisner. Boston: Little, Brown, c 1971.

Curriculum Design in a Changing Society edited by Richard W. Burns and Gary D. Brooks. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Educational Technology Publications [1970]

The Curriculum: Retrospect and Prospect (The Seventieth Yearbook of The National Society for the Study of Education) edited by Robert M. McClure, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971.

Dairs, Harold S. Organizing a Learning Center. Cleveland: Educational Research Council of America [1968]

"A Descriptive and Analytical Study of the Teaching Center Movement in American Education." Journal of Teacher Education 25, no. 1 (Spring 1974) 2-58.

Dickson, George E. Planning a Prototype Teacher Center for Ohio (ED086677) Washington, D.C.: Educational Resources Information Center, 1972.

Edelfelt, R.A. and Darland, D.D. "Fickle Frenzy of Federal Funding; Teacher Centers." Journal of Teacher Education 23 (Spring 1972) 3-4.

Encyclopedia Americana. New York: Americana Corporation, 7 (1976) 669.

Fibkins, William "The Whys and Hows of Teachers' Centers." Phi Delta Kappan (April 1974) 567-509

Glatthorn, Allan A. Alternatives in Education: Schools and Programs. New York: Dodd, Mead, 1975.

Gossage, Wayne. "Letter to ACRL/EBSS Members." College and Research Library News 37 (February 1976) 31-32.

Grobman, Hulda Gross. Developmental Curriculum Projects: Decision Points and Processes Itasca, Illinois: F.E. Peacock, 1970.

Inside-out: The Final Report and Recommendations of the Teachers National Field Task Force on the Improvement and Reform of American Education. Washington: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1974.

Johnson, Harlon R. The Curriculum Materials Center: a Study of Policies and Practices in Selected Centers. Flagstaff, Arizona: Northern Arizona University (ED 081449), 1973.

Koopman, G. Robert. Curriculum Development. New York: The Center for Applied Research in Education, 1966.

Lune, Maurice B. Library Surveys: An Introduction to Their Use, Planning, Procedure and Presentation. Hampden, Connecticut: Archon Books, 1967.

Pilcher, P.S. "Teacher Centers: Can They Work Here?" Phi Delta Kappan 54 (January 1970) 340-343

Poliakoff, L. "Teacher Centers: An Outline of Current Information." Journal of Teacher Education 23 (Fall 1972) 389.

Rochester Conference, Rochester, New York, 1973. Heightened Consciousness, Cultural Revolution and Curriculum Theory; The Proceedings of the Rochester Conference. edited by William Pinar. Berkeley, California: McCutchan Pub. [1974].

Schneider, Allan and Yarger, Sam J. Teaching Centers: Toward the State of the Scene (ED098143) Washington, D.C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, 1974.

Silbeman,A. "Santa's Workshop for Teachers; Philadelphia's Teacher Center" American Education 7 (December 1971) 3-8.

Simpson, Elizabeth J. "A National Network for Curriculum Coordination." American Vocational Journal 48 (October 1973) 22-25, 35.

Smith, B. Othanel. Teachers for the Real World, Washington, D.C.: American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1970.

Stevens, A. "Centre's for Action; James Committee Will Give New Importance to Teachers' Centres." Times Educational Supplement, 2952 (December 17, 1971) 14+

Teacher Education (The Seventy-fourth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part II) edited by Kevin Ryan, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Trump, J. Lloyd. Secondary School Curriculum Improvement; Challenges, Humanism, Accountability. 2nd ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacom [1973]

Turner, Joseph. Making New Schools. New York: David McKay [1971]

Walton, J. "Resources, Teachers and Designers; Report of a National Conference" Forum, 14 (Autumn 1971) 10-12

Wilson, L. Craig. The Open Access Curriculum Boston, Allyn and Bacon [1971].

APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE

A. Administration

1. The curriculum center is presently under the administration of the:

_____school (department, college) of education

_____library

_____other (please specify)_____

2. Ideally the curriculum center should be administered by the:

_____school of education

_____library

_____either school of education or library

_____other (specify)_____

3. The curriculum center itself is directed or administered by:

_____librarian - degree:_____MLS

_____PhD

_____other - degree:_____BA or BS_____major subject

_____MA or MS_____major subject

_____other (specify)_____

4. Ideally the center should be directed by:

_____librarian

_____other (specify)_____

5. The present director of the center is:

_____full-time

_____part-time

6. How many full-time employees are there? _____

Average number of hours worked per week?_____

7. How many part-time employees are there? _____

Average number of hours worked per week?_____

B. Physical Setting

1. What is the enrollment of your institution?_____

2. How many education majors are there in the undergraduate program? _____

3. How many education majors in the graduate program? _____

4. Does the college train two-year para-professionals in teacher education? _____

5. Where is the curriculum center now located. Check one.

_____a separate room or rooms within the library

_____part of the education section within the library

_____a room or rooms in the department (school or faculty) of education building

_____other (please specify)_____

6. If possible, the best physical setting for a curriculum center would be:

_____within the library

_____near the offices of the education faculty

_____other (specify)_____

7. What is the approximate size of the curriculum center in square feet?

_____sq. ft.

8. How much of this space is reader space? _____sq. ft.

C. Stock, Classification, Shelving and Circulation

1. The center collects curriculum and instructional material for:

_____elementary schools

_____secondary schools

_____institutions of higher education

2. If the curriculum center collects the following materials, please indicate if they circulate, how they are arranged on the shelves and how they are accessed (card cat., index, list, etc.) If a form is not collected, write "not collected" next to that item.

Monographs and Periodicals	Circulates		Shelved By						Means of Access
	yes	no	Dewey Class	L. C. Class	Accession Number	Grade Level	Subject	Other	
curriculum guides & or units of work	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	_____
elementary & secondary textbooks	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	_____
free materials catalogs	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	_____
journals:									
professional	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	_____
elementary & secondary	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	_____
pamphlets	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	_____
professional textbooks	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	_____
programmed instructional materials	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	_____
special education materials	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	_____
syllabi	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	_____

Audiovisual Materials	Circulates		Shelved By						Means of Access
	yes	no	Dewey Class	L.C. Class	Accession Number	Grade Level	Subject	Other	
filmstrips	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	_____
games & toys	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	_____
globes	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	_____
graphics: art prints, charts, pictures etc.	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	_____
kinescopes	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	_____
maps	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	_____
microforms: card, fiche & film	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	_____
models	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	_____
motion pictures	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	_____
motion picture loops	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	_____
multimedia kits	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	_____
phonodiscs	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	_____
phonotapes	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	_____
realia: models, dioramas, replicas, etc.	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	_____
simulation media	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	_____
slides	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	_____
transparencies	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	_____
videotapes	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	___	_____

3. If different forms are catalogued and classified, are they interfiled on the shelves (i.e., films and filmstrips next to monographs etc.) or arranged by form and within the form by classification?

_____interfiled on shelves

_____arranged by form

4. If materials circulate, who may borrow them?

_____faculty (staff)

_____students

_____teachers in area

5. Check one.

_____Ideally the collection should be a non-circulating collection designed as a workshop. Materials housed in the center should be used as laboratory tools for experimentation in the center, not as supplementary materials.

_____Ideally all materials in the center should circulate.

6. Check one.

_____If materials circulate, ideally circulation should be limited to faculty, staff and students.

_____If materials circulate, ideally the center should also serve the community, as well as faculty, staff and students and borrowing privileges should be extended to teachers in the community.

. Equipment

1. Does the center have audio-visual equipment or is equipment from some other part of the library (or campus) available for use?

_____AV equipment in center
_____AV equipment in library used for center materials
_____AV equipment available on campus

2. Does the center have a separate room for viewing audio-visual materials or is the audio-visual equipment housed with other materials in the center, or is viewing available in the library or elsewhere on campus?

_____separate room in center
_____housed with other material in center
_____viewing available in the library
_____viewing available elsewhere on campus

3. How many of the following pieces of equipment are available in the center. Please record the number of pieces of equipment available.

____ audiotape recorders

____ duplicating machine

____ film inspection and repair equipment

____ film projectors: 16mm and 8mm

____ filmstrip or combination filmstrip-slide projectors

____ filmstrip viewers

____ listening station

____ microprojectors

____ microreader, some with microfiche attachment

____ microreader printer

____ opaque projectors

____ overhead projectors

____ photocopying machine

____ polarized attachments for slide and transparency projectors

____ portable videotape recorder system with monitor

____ projection carts

____ projection screens

____ record player with junction box and 8 to 10 headsets

____ sound filmstrip projectors

____ stereoscopic and microscope slide viewers

____ 2" x 2" slide projectors

note: the above list is a modification of a list of equipment suggested for an educational media selection center. See Bomar, Cora Paul. Guide to the Development of Educational Media Selection Centers (Chicago: American Library Association, 1973) p. 53.

E. Selection and Acquisition

1. At present the operating budget for the center is part of:

___ the budget of the school (department, college) of education

___ the library budget

___ other (please explain) _____

2. At present the center's budget is administered by:

___ director of the center

___ faculty

___ education bibliographer

___ acquisitions department of library

___ other (please explain)_____

3. In the ideal situation the center's budget should be a part of:

___ the budget of the school (department, college) of education

___ the library

___ other (explain)_____

4. It would probably be best if the center's budget were administered by:

___ director of the center

___ faculty

___ education bibliographer

___ acquisitions department of library

___ other (explain)_____

5. If there is a policy for handling out-dated materials, please outline it briefly.

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

Appendix B

Institutions that Responded to the Questionnaire
Listed in Order of Total Enrollment

Institution	Total[1] Enrollment	Undergraduate[2] Education Majors	Graduate[3] Education Majors
Univ. of Toronto	45,288	----	1,700
Univ. of Wisconsin (Madison)	38,545	2,753	1,294
Wayne State University	38,073	2,000	3,000
New York University	29,698	2,500	4,000
Western Michigan University	23,279	2,726	593
University of Toledo	17,109	----	----
SUNY[5] at Albany	15,414	300	2,300
SUC[4] at Buffalo	12,604	4,000	1,500
SUC at Brockport	11,696	----	----
SUC at Oswego	9,764	966	102
SUNY[5] at Binghamton	9,695	----	400
Univ. of Rochester	8,701	----	227
SUC at Plattsburg	6,709	1,300	----
SUC at Geneseo	6,374	1,742	196
SUC at Oneonta	6,344	1,054	563
Teachers College (Columbia University)	6,107	----	3,000
SUC at Cortland	6,075	682	2,193
SUC at Fredonia	5,233	562	364
SUC at Potsdam	5,021	----	----
Ontario Institute for Studies in Education	1,992	----	2,413
Bank Street College of Education	1,466	----	1,200

[1] Figures taken from Education Directory: Colleges and Universities 1976-77. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, National Center for Educational Statistics, 1977 and Commonwealth Universities Yearbook 1976. London: Association of Commonwealth Universities, 1976.

[2] Figures reported in questionnaire (Appendix A)

[3] Ibid

[4] State University College

[5] State University of New York

Appendix C

Circulation of Monographs and Periodicals

	Circulates			
	Yes	No	NC	NA
Curriculum guides and/or units of work	16	5		
elementary and secondary textbooks	17*	4		
free materials catalogs	5	12	4	
journals: professional	5	6	8	2
children's	5	7	8	1
pamphlets	14	4	2	1
professional textbooks	12	1	7	1
programmed instructional materials	12	2	3	4
special education materials	14*	4	3	
syllabi	11	4	3	3

NC = not collected
NA = no answer
* = 1 center in each case had limited circulation

Appendix D

Circulation of Audiovisual Materials

	Circulates		NC	NA
	Yes	No		
filmstrips	14	2	4	1
games and toys	13	2	4	2
globes	7	5	7	2
graphics: art prints, charts pictures, etc.	13	4	3	1
kinescopes			17	4
maps	10	1	7	3
microforms: card, fiche and film	4	5	10	2
models	8	2	8	3
motion pictures	3	1	14	3
motion picture loops	9	3	7	2
multimedia kits	13	3	4	1
phonodiscs	14	3	3	1
phonotapes	11	5	3	2
realia: models, dioramas, replicas, etc.	8	2	7	5
simulation media	11	2	4	4
slides	13	2	5	1
transparencies	11	1	6	3
videotapes	4	1	13	3

NC = not collected
NA = no answer

Appendix E

Shelving and Classification of Monographs and Periodicals

	Shelved By:							
	Dewey	LC	Subj.	Title	Dewey or LC Subj. with Grade Level	Other	NC	NA
curriculum guides and/or units of work	3	5	5		4	4*		
elementary & secondary textbooks	5	4	5		6	1		
free materials catalogs	3	5	3		2	2**	4	2
journals:								
professional	1	1	1	3		2	8	5
children's	1		1	4		1	8	6
pamphlets	2	2	11		1	1	2	2
professional textbooks	3	5	2		2		7	2
programmed instructional materials	6	3	2		2	1	3	4
special education materials	4	4	4		3	2	3	1
syllabi	2	3	7		3		3	3

NC = not collected
NA = no answer
* 2 are shelved as Canadian documents
** 1 shelved by publishers

Appendix F

Shelving and Classification of Audiovisual Materials

	Shelved by:							
	Dewey or Modified Dewey	LC	Accession No.	Subject	Other	Dewey Grade Level & Subs.	NC	NA
filmstrips	5	5	3		2	1	4	1
games & toys	4	4	1	3	2	1	4	2
graphics: art, prints, charts, pictures etc.	3	2		8	1	1	3	3
kinescopes							17	4
maps	2	2		2	2	1	7	5
microform: card, fiche & film		1	4		2	1	10	3
models	4	1	1	1	2	1	8	3
motion pictures	3					1	14	3
motion picture loops	4	1	2					
multimedia kits	5	3	3	1	1		4	1
phonodiscs	5	2	4	2	2	1	3	2
phonotapes	5	3	3	1	1	1	3	4
realia: models, dioramas, replicas etc.	3	1	1	1	1	1	7	5
simulation media	4	1	1	3	1	1	4	6
slides	5	3	2	3		1	5	2
transparencies	4	2	2	2		1	6	4
videotapes	2	1		1		1	13	3

NC = not collected
NA = no answer

Appendix G

Means of Access of Monographs and Periodicals

	Card Catalog	Browsing	Index Kardex, or List	NC	NA
curriculum guides and/or units of work	16	1	2		2
elementary & secondary textbooks	15	1	1		4
free materials catalogs	12	1	2	4	2
journals:					
professional	3		5	8	5
children's	2	1	5	8	5
pamphlets	9	1	6	2	3
professional textbooks	9	1		7	4
programmed instructional materials	10	1	1	3	6
special education	12	1	1	3	4
syllabi	10	1	1	3	6

NC = not collected
NA = not answered

Appendix H

Means of Access of Audiovisual Materials

	Card Catalog	Browsing	Card Catalog & (list or vertical file or index)	Card Catalog & book catalog	List	NC	NA
filmstrips	9	1	1	1	1	4	4
games & toys	10	1		1	1	4	4
globes	5	3				7	6
graphics: art prints, charts, pictures, etc.	9	2	1		2	3	4
kinescopes						17	4
maps	6	1	1		1	7	5
microforms, card,fiche & film	1	1	1		3	10	5
models	5	1		1		8	6
motion pictures	2	1				14	4
motion picture loops	5	1	1	1	2	7	4
multimedia kits	9	1	1	1		4	5
phonodiscs	10	1	1	1		3	5
phonotapes	9	1		1		3	7
realia, models, dioramas, replicas, etc.	14	1	1	1		7	7
simulation media	7	1		1	1	4	7
slides	7	1		1	3	5	4
transparencies	5	1		1	1	6	7
videotapes	2	1			1	13	4

NC = not collected
NA = no answer